

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF A TYPE-SPECIES
FOR *LITTORINA* FÉRUSSAC, 1822. Z.N.(S.) 1901

By W. O. Cernohorsky (*Auckland Institute and Museum, Auckland, New Zealand*)

Kadolsky (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 27 : 51-54) petitioned the Commission for an acceptance of a type-designation of *Turbo littoreus* Linnaeus, as the type-species of *Littorina* Férussac, 1822. In his summary Kadolsky stated: "I prefer to keep *Turbo littoreus* L. as type-species of *Littorina* Férussac, as only this species was included amongst *Littorina* in the original publication. . . ." If Kadolsky's statement were correct, then *Turbo littoreus* Linnaeus, as the only included species, would *ipso facto* become the type-species by monotypy. From the case outlined by Kadolsky, however, it is apparent that *Littorina* Férussac is actually a genus without included nominal species. The five listed (but not included) species appeared in the original publication in combination with the genus-group name *Turbo* and not *Littorina*, and were attributed to the vernacular "Paludine marine".

Littorina Férussac, being a genus without included species (and from evidence on hand there is no indication to the contrary), would have to take as the type-species *Littorina basterotii* Payraudeau, 1826 (= *Turbo neritoides* Linnaeus, 1758) by subsequent monotypy under the terms of Article 69(a)(2). *Littorina* Férussac, 1822, would then replace *Melaraphe* Menke, 1828. In order to designate *Turbo littoreus* Linnaeus as the type-species of *Littorina* Férussac, the Commission should have been petitioned to set aside all previous type designations.

The genus-group *Neritoides* Brown, 1827, is available for *Nerita littoralis* Linnaeus, since "*Neritoides* Meuschen, 1779" was erected in a non-binomial work in which polynomials were used for specific diagnoses (*Naturforscher* 13 : 85).

By L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden*)

I have read Dr. Kadolsky's application with much interest, but fail to agree with his conclusions. Also there are some inaccuracies in his paper.

De Férussac (1822, *Tabl. systematiques* : xi) did not write "notre sous-genre *littorina*" as cited by Dr. Kadolsky on line 6 of p. 52 of his application, but "notre sous-genre littorine". The latin form *Littorino* being first used on p. xxxiv, being cited there with the vernacular name littorine and the synonyms cited by Dr. Kadolsky on the last line of his para. 3.

As I see it, the only nominal species referred by De Férussac to his sub-genus *Littorina* in the original publication is *Turbo neritoides* L. which on p. xi he assigned to his "sous-genre littorine".

On p. ix De Férussac stated that he formed his sous-genre littorine on the "paludines marines qui constituent le genre *Trochus* d'Adanson". On p. ix and x as, pointed out by Dr. Kadolsky, De Férussac listed a large number of species after 5 of which he gave the indication "Paludina. Marine" (not "Paludine marine"). But this indication is not sufficient to assign these species to *Littorina*, as De Férussac defined his littorine as those marine paludinas that were assigned by Adanson to *Trochus*, while no mention of Adanson is given in his list. As Dr. Kadolsky himself pointed out, De Férussac placed only part of the marine species of his genus *Paludina* in *Littorina*, part were placed in *Rissoa*.

So far as I can see, *Littorina* De Férussac, 1822, has as its type by monotypy, *Turbo neritoides* L.